

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 15, and 18. Claims 1-18 stand rejected and are currently pending.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and hereby request reconsideration. Claim 1 has been amended to recite “[o]ne or more tangible computer-readable media...” Computer-readable media claims that are written in this format have been allowed by the Office.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,280,251 to Strangio. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and hereby request reconsideration.

With regard to claim 1, claim 1 has been modified to add the limitation that a cable-label record is validated when it is stored in the storage component. Furthermore, claim 1 has been modified to add the limitation of generating a cable-label file. Finally, claim 1 has been modified to add the limitation that records are automatically identified and a data stream is automatically provided to the printing device. No manual intervention occurs once the search criteria is received. These limitations do not appear in Strangio. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 9, Applicants’ arguments for claim 1 above are applicable to claim 9 as well. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 15, claim 15 has been modified to add the limitation that a cable-label records controller validates records. This limitation does not appear in Strangio. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 18, claim 18 has been modified to add the limitation of validating data to remove errors. This limitation does not appear in Strangio. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 2, the Examiner has dissected the claim in violation of MPEP 2106. The Examiner rendered a rejection of claim 1 stating the “search criteria” was anticipated by Strangio at column 8, line 67 – column 9, line 1. This portion of Strangio referred to Step 216, Function C relating to searching a disk for a match. Now, the Examiner rendered a rejection of claim 2 stating “a first search parameter” and “a second search parameter” were anticipated by Strangio at column 10, lines 46-54. This portion of Strangio referred to Step 216, Function H relating to analyzing test data. MPEP 2131 states “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” This means that the “search criteria”, “a first search parameter”, and “a second search parameter” must be together in order to reject claim 2. As shown in Strangio, Function C and Function H are not together and do not relate to each other. The functions relate to entirely different and distinct actions. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that claims 3 and 10 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 2 and 9. Claims 4 and 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 3 and 10.

With regard to claim 12, Applicants' arguments for claim 2 above are applicable to claim 12 as well. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 5 and 13, Applicants' arguments for claim 2 above are applicable to claims 5 and 13 as well. No assembling step is disclosed in Strangio. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that claims 6 and 14 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 5 and 13.

With regard to claim 7, Applicants' arguments for claim 1 above is applicable to claim 7 as well. No data stream is disclosed in Strangio. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Applicants submit that the claimed invention is commonly owned as to each inventor.

Claims 8, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,280,251 to Strangio as applied to claims 1 and 15, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,721,414 to Rojas et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and hereby request reconsideration.

MPEP 2143.01 states "[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." It also states "[i]f the proposed modifications or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious."

In Strangio, a cable tester is disclosed. The cable tester is a hardware device with a series of interfaces for connecting cables to the cable tester. In Rojas, a cable manager is disclosed. The cable manager is a software module used to search and track telecommunications paths within a telecommunication system. As shown in Strangio and Rojas, there is no suggestion to combine. Applicants also submit that Strangio and Rojas are not combinable as Strangio deals with a hardware device that physically interfaces with cables and Rojas deals with a software module that analyzes telecommunications paths. The cable manager is never brought into physical contact with a cable, as in Strangio. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 16 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Applicants also submit that claims 8, 16 and 17 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1, 15 and 16.

### **CONCLUSION**

No fee is believed due in connection with this Amendment, but the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard Searcy II/

Leonard Searcy, II  
Reg. No. 53,574

LS/lr

SHOOK, HARDY, & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613  
816/474-6550